



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/582,716	06/30/2000	Yeow Chong Chuah	Q-58912	6895

7590 02/20/2003

Sughrue Mion Zinn Macpeak & Seas
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20037-3202

EXAMINER

FILIPCZYK, MARCIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 02/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/582,716

Applicant(s)

CHUAH, YEOW CHONG

Examiner

Marc R Filipczyk

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 June 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

This Action is responsive to Applicant's response filed on December 19, 2002 (paper #7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the term "correspondence" is indefinite and needs to be revised. Further, how do *fields* relate to data and mapping files?

Regarding claims 2-7 depend from 1, hence inherit the deficiencies of those claims.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as best as an Examiner is able to ascertain being unpatentable by the disclosed art by the applicant over Sampson et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,212,639) in view of Rees et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,878).

Regarding claims 1 and 8, Sampson et al discloses a system and method for data tabulation processing of a data file (raw data) having records (data entries) in data fields, comprising: (col. 3, lines 11-15, Sampson)

- i) a preprocessing stage in which each data value is identified and allocated a numerical identifier unique for that field is inherent from classifying large volumes of raw data (fig. 2 and col. 3, lines 11-15, Sampson); and
- ii) a tabulation stage in which, for each record, a cell of a result array is determined based on the numerical identifiers, and the result array cell incremented (fig. 5, Sampson).

However Sampson does not disclose tabulation and coding processors. Rees on the other hand discloses a coding processor (fig. 3, 110, Rees) and a data reduction processor (fig. 3, 114, Rees) (Note: data reduction processor is used as a tabulation processor). Hence, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Sampson's system by implementing Rees's tabulation and coding processors for faster compilation of data.

Regarding claims 2-4, 9 and 10, Sampson discloses expanding parental set from data file containing the numerical identifiers for the data values in each field, and a mapping file which stores a correspondence between each of the distinct data values in the fields and the corresponding numerical identifiers (see col. 3, lines 34-36, Sampson).

(Note: 1. A mapping function is used to generate encoded data. 2. Expanded parental set is encoded data.)

Regarding claims 5-7, 11 and 12, Sampson discloses a result array (fig. 5, Sampson). It is a common programming technique to initialize arrays to have a starting point and to maintain available memory for use as needed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on December 20th, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The arguments and responses are listed below.

Applicant argues on page 6 of the 12/20/2002 response after amending claims 1 and 2 that "Sampson does not disclose or suggest allocating a unique numerical identifier for each distinct data value for each individual field, wherein a mapping file is generated".

In response to Applicant's argument, Examiner disagrees. Col. 3, lines 34-40, a mapping function is applied to the data entries in the parental set (data file) and an item indicator *uniquely* defines an associated item, which in fact is the distinct data. Applicant simply generates a mapping file for storing distinct data values in the fields with their corresponding identifiers which has been addressed in the above rejections and further is illustrated in fig. 4, microcomputer, Sampson.

Applicant argues on page 6 of the 12/20/2002 response that, "Since claims 2-12 depend on claim 1, Applicants submit that they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency".

In response to Applicant's argument, Examiner disagrees. Claims 2-12 are not patentable at least by virtue of their dependency because all the independent claims are rejected by prior art of record, further, Examiner reminds the Applicant that claims 8-12 are not dependant from claim 1.

With respect to all the pending claims 1-12, Examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's assertion based on the discussion cited above, as such, Examiner maintains the same rejections.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc R Filipczyk whose telephone number is 703-305-7156. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8am-4:30pm.

Art Unit: 2171

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

MF
February 13, 2003



SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100